repulsio dogmatibus physicorum

دون له أحمد م.

I

Prima Quaestio

p1• special relativity applies to inertial frames.

p2• in an inertial description, planets are in motion and the sun itself has motion [exempli gratia: orbits the milky way], this also negates the stationary concept of the earth, in premise 3 I shall respond to a possible response.

p3• the observational standpoint “the earth is stationary for us” is an observer-relative description [id est• it is an assumption about our reference frame, not direct proof of absolute rest, nor sunnah proof nor quranic]

p4• physics produces empirical laws via reason plus mathematics: mathematics formulates theories, but reason and empirical testing justify which formulation we accept; therefore multiple mathematically-consistent descriptions [exempli gratia: heliocentric or geocentric] can in principle be constructed, but they may require introducing fictitious forces to match observations.

p5• classical scholarly [muslim & catholic] positions hold the earth stationary “inward and outward”, this as a theological-interpretive claim is independent of whether modern physics endorses it or endorses it.

∧

• even if physics gives a successful inertial-frame description where the sun moves, that does not logically force rejection of the scholarly claim that the earth is stationary [because the scholarly claim is asserted as doctrinal and not empirically dependent].

∨

ergō• the scholarly claim that the Earth is stationary remains valid (within its own theological framework) regardless of whether physics models the system heliocentrically; attempts to make a geocentric physics are possible in principle but will require additional fictitious forces or assumptions.

now a response to possible doubts; we don't deny empirical observation, nor do we "make a theological point immune to reality", and this in reality self refutes to be honest, for the attributes of god are not an empirical observation, rather they are a theological observation, so if one asserts this as a reductio then he is obligated to reject the attributes of god since [∵] they don't preserve empirical observation, and he falls into the traps of hume and his retarded assumptions.

In summary: ¬physics ⊭ ¬truth.

Secunda Quaestio

a reductio of the mass use of ocham's razor;

Π1• occam's razor asserts that • all else equal, the simplest explanation is preferable.

Π2• "simplicity" is [saepe] interpreted as **brevity of explanation**.

Π3• truth is **independent of the length or complexity** of an explanation; a complex exposition can preserve truth fully.

Π5• limiting explanatory adequacy to simplicity especially as a universal principle is **unjustified**, because the truth of a proposition does not necessarily correlate with its brevity.

∴ ocham's razor **cannot be treated as a universal law of reasoning** to reject compact explanation, i do suppose the law doesn't even assert a rejection of compact explanations, however this distinction should be made since complex explanations may equally or more accurately preserve truth.

In summary: ∃x (CE(x) ∧ TE(x)).

arbitrary to what is being discussed I do see it beneficial I assert a reductio upon moral relativism as a primer for what's to come, moral relativism asserts that all value judgments are subjective, including moral and epistemic evaluations (id est • no value is objectively binding), this is basically premise one with the exception that it hasn't been numbered.

π2• valuing logic and reason [id est• holding to coherence & non-contradiction] is itself a value judgment**.**

π3• if all value judgments are subjective (from π1), then valuing logic is also subjective, and its normative force is not binding but arbitrary.

π4• if logic is arbitrary, then the principles of valid inference (including LNC, LEM P∨ ¬P) are not obligatory, meaning any argument can be both true and false without contradiction.

π5• Moral relativism depends on logical reasoning to assert its own claim (id
est • it uses arguments, analogies, and critique).

π6• If logic is arbitrary (from π4), then the argument for moral relativism cannot coherently assert itself, because its very method of proof loses normative force.

∴ moral relativism **self-refutes**: it cannot consistently maintain the subjectivity of all values while simultaneously valuing logic, because valuing logic is itself a value judgment [of hierarchy] that must retain at least minimal objectivity to make any argument coherent.

I would prefer to mention that I do not see (aristotlelian) logic a valid science, meaning; it is not universally applicable, and certain laws and so on should be rejected, deductive reasoning does not preserve truth always, nor does non-deductive reasoning always preserve probability and this is a fallacy which need not a response, you could probably assert a valid dichotomy in the sense of probability preserving truth, likewise with deductive reasoning preserving probability, however in summary I take the quran, the sunnah of the messenger muhammad ﷺ and the understanding of

the first three generations as evidence, spirituality and in a worldly sense and anyone who desires to disagree can rub his face in dirt and reiterate his disagreement within the mud his face is covered with, the works of ibn taymiyyah suffice as a response.

IIII

Quarta Quaesto

To strengthen the integrity of the first quaestio I shall share certain excerpts of physicists admitting that heliocentrism is a philosophical concept formulated by math; Fred Hoyle (1915- 2001), famous English astronomer, wrote:

> Let it be understood at the outset that it makes no difference, from the point of view of describing planetary motion, whether we take the Earth or the Sun as the center of the solar system. Since the issue is one of relative motion only, there are infinitely many exactly equivalent descriptions referred to different centers - in principle any point will do, the Moon, Jupiter…. So the passions loosed on the world by the publication of Copernicus' book, De revolutionibus orbium caelestium libri VI, were logically irrelevant.

Nicolaus Copernicus: An Essay on his Life and Work, (Harper & Row, 1973), p.1.

Likewise, George Ellis who is a famous theoretical physicist and astronomer who authored books with Stephen Hawking. In a profile in Scientific American W.W. Gibbs quotes Ellis:

> People need to be aware that there is a range of models that could explain the observations... For instance, I can construct you a spherically symmetrical universe with Earth at its center, and you cannot disprove it based on observations... You can only exclude it on philosophical grounds...
>
> What I want to bring into the open is the fact that we are using philosophical criteria in choosing our models. A lot of cosmology tries to hide that.

Scientific American 273(4):55, October 1995.

The claim I am making clear here, is that physics is based on pure reason, thus does not preserve truth inherently, whether geocentrism or heliocentrism is preferred, it all returns to my first quaestio in stating that either can be substantiated for, it is arbitrary for me to exhibit to what view I take for, this isn't the reason I postulate for my first quaestio, the reason is to show it is all based on reason and not evident truth.

IIII

Quinta Quaesto

We do not treat empirical regularities as universal laws that cannot be broken, I could prove my view through a diluted version of Hume's problem of induction, however to save time I shall posit an analogy or two to show that it's universality is very absurd.

An example is Newton's Constant; objects in free fall accelerate at 9.8 m/s^2 near Earth's surface, this is moreover an approximation; at relativistic speeds or in strong gravitational fields, Newtonian laws fail and general relativity takes over.

Therefore, empirical laws have domains of validity; they are not universal in all contexts.

Empiricism is not always valid, and anyone who says otherwise, and i'm sorry to say it; is an absolute donkey.

In summary: $E(x) \rightarrow \neg U(x)$
E for empiricism, U for universality.

A question I sincerely pose to the protestant [from a muslim], you choose to disbelieve in 30 verses clearly indicating geocentrism, yet you claim christianity? the same I ask to the sururi extremist retard, you choose to reject every single exegisis, and every scholar who takes the view of geocentrism, yet you claim love for the sunnah of the prophet ﷺ? From al-qurtubi, at-tabari, at-tuwayjiri, ibn baz et cetera, but physics which preserves probability outweighs your religion and the views of its scholars?

Now for clarity: This diluted version of Physic Empiricism says "only what we observe and measure is valid." however in physics, some of the most essential concepts are not directly observable: Spacetime curvature in general relativity is never observed directly, we measure effects (like light bending).Quantum wavefunctions are mathematical constructs, not empirical objects. Dark matter and dark energy are posited not because we see them, but because equations don't work without them.

Mathematics itself is not empirical, it's abstract. Yet physics cannot move an inch without it. This shows the human mind's capacity for necessary truths beyond sensory data, and if you were to say, "only what is empirically verifiable is meaningful," that very principle is not empirically verifiable itself, It is a philosophical claim about knowledge. Thus, strict empiricism is self-defeating.

Drawing from my Newtonian analogy, I offer this concise explanation: we begin with a given observation, which is synthesized into Model A. Later, empiricism produces a new observation, giving rise to Model B, which overlaps with Model A. Since physics is concerned with the how of things as revealed through observation, it is thereby compelled to explain why both models have held sway. History demonstrates that this has indeed occurred within physics. Thus I conclude: within its own framework, strict empiricism does not safeguard truth itself, it safeguards only probability, for by its nature it commits to variation.

Another paradigmatic case is the evolving understanding of the nature of light. Newton's corpuscular theory (Model A) successfully described reflection and rectilinear propagation, positing that light consists of discrete particles. The discovery of interference patterns in Young's double-slit experiment (1801) revealed phenomena incompatible with a purely particulate description, giving rise to the wave theory of light (Model B) and explaining diffraction and interference. Later, the photoelectric effect (Einstein, 1905) demonstrated that light also behaves as discrete quanta under certain conditions, necessitating a quantum model (Model C) that reconciles wave- and particle-like behavior. Each successive model did not wholly invalidate its predecessors; rather, it demonstrated the conditions under which prior models accurately approximated natural phenomena.

From this, one has to conclude that strict empiricism, considered as a self-contained epistemological framework, does not safeguard absolute truth. Instead, it safeguards probability, as each empirical observation inherently permits variation and necessitates the continual refinement of models to accommodate new data. Physics, in this respect, illustrates the limitations of empiricism in guaranteeing truth beyond probabilistic approximation.

Quaesto Sexta

VI

Here I would like to defend a position of one of the shuyukh who posted an article on his website, Abu Iyādh, with the organisation SPUBS, may Allah preserve him, and I see it absurd that the sururi's mock him for taking such a position, this is in reality all resolves around the definition of the I.A.U [id est• international astronomical union] of what a planet is, the first factor being that it must orbit a star. Now of course as geocentrist, Sheikh Abu Iyadh rejects it orbits the star [the sun], so this in all honesty

is a matter with regard to semantics and he can not be mocked for it, and anyone who mocks his view is a retard who has to mock all of the mufassireen and the salaf for taking the view of geocentrism, he has to likewise mock the quran, I say with all honesty, become an atheist, if you are willing to reject the scholarly view of the earth being stationary which is the view of all muslim scholars, for a simple probable belief in physics, postulated by atheists, save yourself time and become an atheist